REMARKS

Claim 13 has been amended to call for the imposition of dielectric material exclusively under said inductor. In this way, the generation of eddy currents may be significantly reduced in the overlying inductor.

No such structure is taught by Darrow. To the contrary, Darrow teaches away from the claimed invention by suggesting the provision of a metallic material underneath the inductor 140. For example, the flexible membrane 150 is apparently produced in accordance with techniques described in connection with Figure 7. See column 7, lines 57-59. In connection with Figure 7, it is explained that a thin film of shape memory alloy, such as Ti-Ni is utilized to coat the flexible membrane. Thus, a conductive material is positioned underneath the inductor 140. The shape memory alloy would apparently be the material 152, which is not discussed in connection with Figure 8, but obviously corresponds to the layer 128 in Figure 7. Therefore, the Darrow patent teaches away from the claimed invention set forth in claim 13 and, therefore, claim 13 should patentably distinguish over the art of record.

With respect to claim 18, there is no teaching of a dielectric material coating the backside of a wafer with a backside aperture. In this application, the additional dielectric material coating the backside of the wafer provides extra support for the region weakened by forming the aperture. There is no suggestion of coating the backside of the wafer for an apertured region in any reference and it is not well known in the art to do so. To the extent the Examiner is contending that such a feature is well known, the Examiner is respectfully requested to cite a reference in support thereof.

With respect to new claim 22, again, the provision of an integrated inductor over a region which is completely dielectric is nowhere suggested in any of the cited art. Plainly, Darrow teaches away since he incorporates the layer 152, which is metallic. Moreover, it is clear that the spiral inductor 140 extends, not only over the aperture (denominated 150 in the office action) but also over the substrate where no aperture has been formed. Since claim 22 calls for all the material under the inductor to be dielectric material, the Darrow reference fails to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention

[illegible] and many of the things that Darrow does would only aggravate eddy currents. For example, the provision of a material in the aperture, which expands and contracts causing mechanical movement, would result in noise in the overlying inductor. That is exactly what

Darrow wants. In other words, Darrow wants to generate noise which can be detected so that movement can be determined. In the claimed invention, the idea is to reduce eddy currents and other noise and, therefore, the aims are directly contrary.

Since Darrow teaches generating noise, he teaches away from the invention as claimed. Therefore, reconsideration of any obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2003

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]